



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,196	10/13/2005	Akira Hasegawa	Q89903	1268
23373	7590	09/24/2007	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			FIORITO, JAMES	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 800			1754	
WASHINGTON, DC 20037				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/24/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/553,196	HASEGAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner James A. Fiorito	Art Unit 1754	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extension of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/06, 6/06</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kasuga “Formation of titanium oxide nanotube”, American Chemical Society (1998).

Kasuga teaches a method of producing titania nanotubes by dispersing nanometer size titanium dioxide in sodium hydroxide at temperature of 60 degrees C (Page 3161 Column 2). The resulting nanotubes have a diameter of 0.05 – 0.15 microns and an aspect ratio between 40 and 100 (Page 3160 Column 1).

Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kasuga “Formation of titanium oxide nanotube”, American Chemical Society

(1998) in view of Grimes “A sentinel sensor network for hydrogen sensing”,

Sensors (Published February 2003).

Kasuga does not expressly teach a sensor having the titania nanotube according to claim 1 or 2 and an electrode in which the titania nanotube and the electrode are connected.

Grimes teaches the use of titania nanotubes as hydrogen sensors, wherein the titania nanotubes are connected to platinum electrodes (Abstract).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to form the process of Kasuga to include the titania nanotubes being used as hydrogen sensors in view of the teaching of Grimes. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to form a wireless sensor network for in-situ monitoring of atmospheric hydrogen concentration (Abstract).

Claims 1-2, 5, and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kasuga “Titania nanotubes prepared by chemical processing” Adv. Mater (1999).

Kasuga teaches a method of producing titania nanotubes by dispersing titanium dioxide in sodium hydroxide at temperature of 110 degrees C (Page 1307 Column 1). The resulting nanotubes have a diameter of 8 nm and a length of 100 nm (Page 1307 Column 1).

Claims 3-4, 6-7, and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kasuga “Titania nanotubes prepared by chemical processing” Adv. Mater (1999) in view of Grimes “A sentinel sensor network for hydrogen sensing”, Sensors (Published February 2003).

Kasuga does not expressly teach a sensor having the titania nanotube according to claim 1 or 2 and an electrode in which the titania nanotube and the electrode are connected.

Grimes teaches the use of titania nanotubes as hydrogen sensors, wherein the titania nanotubes are connected to platinum electrodes (Abstract).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to form the process of Kasuga to include the titania nanotubes being used as hydrogen sensors in view of the teaching of Grimes. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to form a wireless sensor network for in-situ monitoring of atmospheric hydrogen concentration (Abstract).

Kasuga does not expressly disclose the aspect ratio of the nanotubes or the particle size of the titania powder. However, where the claimed and prior art product(s) are identical or substantially identical, or are produced by identical or substantially identical process(es) the burden of proof is on applicant to establish that the prior art product(s) do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of the instantly claimed product(s), see *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James A. Fiorito whose telephone number is (571)272-7426. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am - 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on (571) 272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

James Fiorito JF
Patent Examiner
AU 1754

Maynard Langel
Wayne A. Langel
GAU 1754